

AXIOMATIZATION OF IF-THEN-ELSE OVER MONOIDS OF POSSIBLY NON-HALTING PROGRAMS AND TESTS

GAYATRI PANICKER, K. V. KRISHNA, AND PURANDAR BHADURI

ABSTRACT. In order to study the axiomatization of the **if-then-else** construct over possibly non-halting programs and tests, the notion of *C*-sets was introduced in the literature by considering the tests from an abstract *C*-algebra. This paper extends the notion of *C*-sets to *C*-monoids which include the composition of programs as well as composition of programs with tests. For the class of *C*-monoids where the *C*-algebras are adas a canonical representation in terms of functional *C*-monoids is obtained.

INTRODUCTION

The algebraic properties of the program construct **if-then-else** have been studied in great detail under various contexts. For example, in [8, 17, 21], the authors investigated on axiom schema for determination of the semantic equivalence between the conditional expressions. The authors in [2, 5, 18] studied complete proof systems for various versions of **if-then-else**. While a transformational characterization of **if-then-else** was given in [16], an axiomatization of equality test algebras was considered in [9, 20]. In [1, 22], **if-then-else** was studied as an action of Boolean algebra on a set. Due to their close relation with program features, functions have been canonical models for studies on algebraic semantics of programs.

In [12] Kennison defined comparison algebras as those equipped with a quaternary operation $C(s, t, u, v)$ satisfying certain identities modelling the equality test. He also showed that such algebras are simple if and only if C is the direct comparison operation C_0 given by $C_0(s, t, u, v)$ taking value u if $s = t$ and v otherwise. This was extended by Stokes in [23] to semigroups and monoids. He showed that every comparison semigroup (monoid) is embeddable in the comparison semigroup (monoid) $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of all total functions $X \rightarrow X$, for some set X . He also obtained a similar result in terms of partial functions $X \rightarrow X$. In [10] Jackson and Stokes gave a complete axiomatization of **if-then-else** over halting programs and tests. They also modelled composition of functions and of functions with predicates and called this object a *B*-monoid and further showed that the more natural setting of only considering composition of functions would not admit a finite axiomatization. They proved that every *B*-monoid is embeddable in a functional *B*-monoid comprising total functions and halting tests and thus achieved a Cayley-type theorem for the class of *B*-monoids. The work listed above predominantly considered the case where the tests are halting and drawn from a Boolean algebra. A natural interest is to study non-halting tests and programs.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 08A70, 03G25 and 68N15.

Key words and phrases. Axiomatization, if-then-else, non-halting programs, *C*-algebra.

There are multiple studies (e.g., see [3, 7, 13, 14]) on extending two-valued Boolean logic to three-valued logic. However McCarthy’s logic (cf. [17]) is distinct in that it models the short-circuit evaluation exhibited by programming languages that evaluate expressions in sequential order, from left to right. In [6] Guzmán and Squier gave a complete axiomatization of McCarthy’s three-valued logic and called the corresponding algebra a *C*-algebra, or the algebra of conditional logic. While studying **if-then-else** algebras in [15], Manes defined an *ada* (Algebra of Disjoint Alternatives) which is essentially a *C*-algebra equipped with an oracle for the halting problem.

Jackson and Stokes in [11] studied the algebraic theory of computable functions, which can be viewed as possibly non-halting programs, together with composition, **if-then-else** and **while-do**. In this work they assumed that the tests form a Boolean algebra. Further, they demonstrated how an algebra of non-halting tests could be constructed from Boolean tests in their setting. Jackson and Stokes proposed an alternative approach by considering an abstract collection of non-halting tests and posed the following problem:

Characterize the algebras of computable functions associated with an abstract C-algebra of non-halting tests.

The authors in [19] have approached the problem by adopting the approach of Jackson and Stokes in [10]. The notion of a *C-set* was introduced through which a complete axiomatization for **if-then-else** over a class of possibly non-halting programs and tests, where tests are drawn from an *ada*, was provided.

In this paper, following the approach of Jackson and Stokes in [10], we extend the notion of *C*-sets to include composition of possibly non-halting programs and of these programs with possibly non-halting tests. This object is termed a *C-monoid* and we show that every *C-monoid* where the tests are drawn from an *ada* is embeddable in a canonical model of *C-monoids*, viz., functional *C-monoids*. The organisation of the paper is as follows. In Section 1 we provide necessary background material including the notion of *C*-sets and their properties. We introduce the notion of a *C-monoid* in Section 2 and give various examples thereof. In Section 3 we delineate the procedure to achieve a Cayley-type theorem and embed every *C-monoid* where the tests are drawn from an *ada* into a functional *C-monoid*. We conclude the paper in Section 4.

1. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present the necessary background material. First we recall the concept of *B*-sets. The notion of a *B-set* was introduced by Bergman in [1] and elucidated by Jackson and Stokes in [10] to study the theory of halting programs equipped with the operation of **if-then-else**.

Definition 1.1. Let $\langle Q, \vee, \wedge, \neg, T, F \rangle$ be a Boolean algebra and S be a set. A *B-set* is a pair (S, Q) , equipped with a function $\eta : Q \times S \times S \rightarrow S$, called *B-action*, where $\eta(\alpha, a, b)$ is denoted by $\alpha[a, b]$, read “**if** α **then** a **else** b ”, that satisfies the following axioms for all $\alpha, \beta \in Q$ and $a, b, c \in S$:

- (1) $\alpha[a, a] = a$
- (2) $\alpha[\alpha[a, b], c] = \alpha[a, c]$
- (3) $\alpha[a, \alpha[b, c]] = \alpha[a, c]$
- (4) $F[a, b] = b$
- (5) $\neg\alpha[a, b] = \alpha[b, a]$
- (6) $(\alpha \wedge \beta)[a, b] = \alpha[\beta[a, b], b]$

In [10] Jackson and Stokes also considered the case of modelling **if-then-else** over a collection of programs with composition by including an operation to capture the composition of programs with tests.

Definition 1.2. Let $(S, \cdot)$ be a monoid with identity element 1 and (S, Q) be a B -set. The pair (S, Q) equipped with a function $\circ : S \times Q \rightarrow Q$ is said to be a B -monoid if it satisfies the following axioms for all $a, b, c \in S$ and $\alpha, \beta \in Q$:

- (7) $a \circ T = T$
- (8) $(a \circ \alpha) \wedge (a \circ \beta) = a \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta)$
- (9) $a \circ (\neg\alpha) = \neg(a \circ \alpha)$
- (10) $a \circ (b \circ \alpha) = (a \cdot b) \circ \alpha$
- (11) $\alpha[a, b] \cdot c = \alpha[a \cdot c, b \cdot c]$
- (12) $a \cdot \alpha[b, c] = (a \circ \alpha)[a \cdot b, a \cdot c]$
- (13) $\beta[a, b] \circ \alpha = (\beta \wedge (a \circ \alpha)) \vee (\neg\beta \wedge (b \circ \alpha))$ (written $\beta[a \circ \alpha, b \circ \alpha]$)
- (14) $1 \circ \alpha = \alpha$

Since functions on sets model programs, standard examples of B -sets and B -monoids come from functions on sets. Let X and Y be two sets. The set of all functions $X \rightarrow Y$ will be denoted by Y^X while the set of all functions $X \rightarrow X$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{T}(X)$.

Let 2 be the two element Boolean algebra. For any set X the pair $(\mathcal{T}(X), 2^X)$ is a B -set with the following action for all $\alpha \in 2^X$ and $g, h \in \mathcal{T}(X)$:

$$\alpha[g, h](x) = \begin{cases} g(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = T; \\ h(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = F. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}(X)$ is a monoid with respect to usual composition of mappings. The B -set $(\mathcal{T}(X), 2^X)$ equipped with the operation $\circ$ defined by

$$(f \circ \alpha) = \{x \in X : f(x) \in \alpha\}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{T}(X)$ and $\alpha \in 2^X$ is a B -monoid. In fact, Jackson and Stokes obtained the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3 ([10]). *Every B -monoid (S, Q) is embeddable as a two-sorted algebra into the B -monoid $(\mathcal{T}(X), 2^X)$ for some set X . Furthermore, if S and Q are finite, then X is finite.*

In [6] Guzmán and Squier introduced the notion of a C -algebra as the algebra corresponding to McCarthy's three-valued logic (cf. [17]).

Definition 1.4. A *C-algebra* is an algebra $\langle M, \vee, \wedge, \neg \rangle$ of type $(2, 2, 1)$, which satisfies the following axioms for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in M$:

- (15) $\neg\neg\alpha = \alpha$
- (16) $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$
- (17) $(\alpha \wedge \beta) \wedge \gamma = \alpha \wedge (\beta \wedge \gamma)$
- (18) $\alpha \wedge (\beta \vee \gamma) = (\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\alpha \wedge \gamma)$
- (19) $(\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge \gamma = (\alpha \wedge \gamma) \vee (\neg\alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma)$
- (20) $\alpha \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta) = \alpha$
- (21) $(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\beta \wedge \alpha) = (\beta \wedge \alpha) \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta)$

It is easy to see that every Boolean algebra is a *C-algebra*. In particular, 2 is a *C-algebra*. Let 3 denote the *C-algebra* with the universe $\{T, F, U\}$ and the following operations.

$\neg$		$\wedge$	T	F	U	$\vee$	T	F	U
T	F	T	T	F	U	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	F	F	F	F	T	F	U
U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U

In fact, the *C-algebra* 3 is the McCarthy's three-valued logic.

In view of the fact that the class of *C-algebras* is a variety, for any set X , 3^X is a *C-algebra* with the operations defined pointwise. Guzmán and Squier in [6] showed that elements of 3^X along with the *C-algebra* operations may be viewed in terms of *pairs of sets*. This is a pair (A, B) where $A, B \subseteq X$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Akin to the well-known correlation between 2^X and the power set $\mathcal{P}(X)$ of X , for any element $\alpha \in 3^X$, associate the pair of sets $(\alpha^{-1}(T), \alpha^{-1}(F))$. Conversely, for any pair of sets (A, B) where $A, B \subseteq X$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$ associate the function α where $\alpha(x) = T$ if $x \in A$, $\alpha(x) = F$ if $x \in B$ and $\alpha(x) = U$ otherwise. With this correlation, the operations can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \neg(A_1, A_2) &= (A_2, A_1) \\
 (A_1, A_2) \wedge (B_1, B_2) &= (A_1 \cap B_1, A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap B_2)) \\
 (A_1, A_2) \vee (B_1, B_2) &= ((A_1 \cup (A_2 \cap B_1), A_2 \cap B_2)
 \end{aligned}$$

Notation 1.5. We use M to denote an arbitrary *C-algebra*. By a *C-algebra* with T, F, U we mean a *C-algebra* with nullary operations T, F, U , where T is the (unique) left-identity (and right-identity) for $\wedge$, F is the (unique) left-identity (and right-identity) for $\vee$ and U is the (unique) fixed point for $\neg$. Note that U is also a left-zero for both $\wedge$ and $\vee$ while F is a left-zero for $\wedge$.

In [15] Manes introduced the notion of *ada* (algebra of disjoint alternatives) which is a *C-algebra* equipped with an oracle for the halting problem.

Definition 1.6. An *ada* is a C -algebra M with T, F, U equipped with an additional unary operation $()^\downarrow$ subject to the following equations for all $\alpha, \beta \in M$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(22) \quad & F^\downarrow = F \\
(23) \quad & U^\downarrow = F \\
(24) \quad & T^\downarrow = T \\
(25) \quad & \alpha \wedge \beta^\downarrow = \alpha \wedge (\alpha \wedge \beta)^\downarrow \\
(26) \quad & \alpha^\downarrow \vee \neg(\alpha^\downarrow) = T \\
(27) \quad & \alpha = \alpha^\downarrow \vee \alpha
\end{aligned}$$

The C -algebra $\mathbb{3}$ with the unary operation $()^\downarrow$ defined by (22), (23) and (24) forms an *ada*. This *ada* will also be denoted by $\mathbb{3}$. One may easily resolve the notation overloading – whether $\mathbb{3}$ is a C -algebra or an *ada* – depending on the context. In [15] Manes showed that the *ada* $\mathbb{3}$ is the only subdirectly irreducible *ada*. For any set X , $\mathbb{3}^X$ is an *ada* with operations defined pointwise. Note that the *ada* $\mathbb{3}$ is also simple.

We use the following notations related to sets and equivalence relations.

Notation 1.7.

- (1) Let X be a set and $\perp \notin X$. The pointed set $X \cup \{\perp\}$ with base point $\perp$ is denoted by $X_\perp$.
- (2) The set of all functions on $X_\perp$ which fix $\perp$ is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$, i.e., $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp) = \{f \in \mathcal{T}(X_\perp) : f(\perp) = \perp\}$.
- (3) Under an equivalence relation σ on a set A , the equivalence class of an element $p \in A$ will be denoted by $\bar{p}^\sigma$. Within a given context, if there is no ambiguity, we may simply denote the equivalence class by $\bar{p}$.

In order to axiomatize **if-then-else** over possibly non-halting programmes and tests, in [19], Panicker et al. considered the tests from a C -algebra and introduced the notion of C -sets. We now recall the notion of a C -set.

Definition 1.8. Let $S_\perp$ be a pointed set with base point $\perp$ and M be a C -algebra with T, F, U . The pair $(S_\perp, M)$ equipped with an action

$$\cdot [-, -] : M \times S_\perp \times S_\perp \rightarrow S_\perp$$

is called a C -set if it satisfies the following axioms for all $\alpha, \beta \in M$ and $s, t, u, v \in S_\perp$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(28) \quad & U[s, t] = \perp & (U\text{-axiom}) \\
(29) \quad & F[s, t] = t & (F\text{-axiom}) \\
(30) \quad & (\neg\alpha)[s, t] = \alpha[t, s] & (\neg\text{-axiom}) \\
(31) \quad & \alpha[\alpha[s, t], u] = \alpha[s, u] & (\text{positive redundancy}) \\
(32) \quad & \alpha[s, \alpha[t, u]] = \alpha[s, u] & (\text{negative redundancy}) \\
(33) \quad & (\alpha \wedge \beta)[s, t] = \alpha[\beta[s, t], t] & (\wedge\text{-axiom}) \\
(34) \quad & \alpha[\beta[s, t], \beta[u, v]] = \beta[\alpha[s, u], \alpha[t, v]] & (\text{premise interchange}) \\
(35) \quad & \alpha[s, t] = \alpha[t, t] \Rightarrow (\alpha \wedge \beta)[s, t] = (\alpha \wedge \beta)[t, t] & (\wedge\text{-compatibility})
\end{aligned}$$

Let M be a C -algebra with T, F, U treated as a pointed set with base point U . The pair (M, M) is a C -set under the following action for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in M$:

$$\alpha[\beta, \gamma] = (\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\neg\alpha \wedge \gamma).$$

We denote the action of the C -set (M, M) by $_[-, _]$. In [19], Panicker et al. showed that the axiomatization is complete for the class of C -sets $(S_\perp, M)$ when M is an ada. In that connection, they obtained some properties of C -sets. Amongst, in Proposition 1.9 below, we list certain properties related to congruences which are useful in the present work. Viewing C -sets as two-sorted algebras, a *congruence* of a C -set is a pair (σ, τ) , where σ is an equivalence relation on $S_\perp$ and τ is a congruence on the ada M such that $(s, t), (u, v) \in \sigma$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \tau$ imply that $(\alpha[s, u], \beta[t, v]) \in \sigma$.

Proposition 1.9 ([19]). *Let $(S_\perp, M)$ be a C -set where M is an ada. For each maximal congruence θ on M , let E_θ be the relation on $S_\perp$ given by*

$$E_\theta = \{(s, t) \in S_\perp \times S_\perp : \beta[s, t] = \beta[t, t] \text{ for some } \beta \in \overline{T}^\theta\}.$$

Then we have the following properties:

- (i) *For $\alpha \in M$ and $s, t \in S_\perp$, if $(\alpha, \beta) \in \theta$ then according to $\beta = T, F$ or U , we have $(\alpha[s, t], s) \in E_\theta, (\alpha[s, t], t) \in E_\theta$ or $(\alpha[s, t], \perp) \in E_\theta$, respectively.*
- (ii) *The pair (E_θ, θ) is a C -set congruence.*
- (iii) *For the C -set (M, M) the equivalence E_θ on M , denoted by E_{θ_M} , is a subset of θ .*
- (iv) $\bigcap_{\theta} E_\theta = \Delta_{S_\perp}$, *where θ ranges over all maximal congruences on M .*
- (v) *The intersection of all maximal congruences on M is trivial, that is $\bigcap \theta = \Delta_M$ where θ ranges over all maximal congruences on M .*

For more details on C -sets one may refer to [19].

2. C -MONOIDS

We now include the case where the composition of two elements of the base set and of an element with a predicate is allowed. Our motivating example is $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathbb{3}^X)$, where $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ is considered to be a monoid with zero by equipping it with composition of functions. The composition will be written from left to right, i.e., $(f \cdot g)(x) = g(f(x))$. The monoid identity in $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ is the identity function $id_{X_\perp}$ and the zero element is $\zeta_\perp$, the constant function taking the value $\perp$. We also include composition of functions with predicates via the natural interpretation given by the following for all $f \in \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{3}^X$:

$$(36) \quad (f \circ \alpha)(x) = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } \alpha(f(x)) = T; \\ F, & \text{if } \alpha(f(x)) = F; \\ U, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if the composition takes value T or F at some point $x \in X_\perp$ then as $\alpha \in \mathbb{3}^X$ this implies that $f(x) \neq \perp$.

With this example in mind we define a C -monoid as follows.

Definition 2.1. Let $(S_\perp, \cdot)$ be a monoid with identity element 1 and zero element $\perp$ where $\perp \cdot s = \perp = s \cdot \perp$. Let M be a C -algebra and $(S_\perp, M)$ be a C -set with $\perp$ as the base point of the pointed set $S_\perp$. The pair $(S_\perp, M)$ equipped with a function

$$\circ : S_\perp \times M \rightarrow M$$

is said to be a C -monoid if it satisfies the following axioms for all $s, t, r, u \in S_\perp$ and $\alpha, \beta \in M$:

- (37) $\perp \circ \alpha = U$ ($\perp$ -o-axiom)
- (38) $t \circ U = U$ (U -o-axiom)
- (39) $1 \circ \alpha = \alpha$ (1 -o-axiom)
- (40) $s \circ (\neg \alpha) = \neg(s \circ \alpha)$ ($\neg$ -o-axiom)
- (41) $s \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) = (s \circ \alpha) \wedge (s \circ \beta)$ ($\wedge$ -o-axiom)
- (42) $(s \cdot t) \circ \alpha = s \circ (t \circ \alpha)$ (semigroup action)
- (43) $\alpha[s, t] \cdot u = \alpha[s \cdot u, t \cdot u]$ (right composition)
- (44) $r \cdot \alpha[s, t] = (r \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t]$ (left composition)
- (45) $\alpha[s, t] \circ \beta = \alpha[s \circ \beta, t \circ \beta]$ ($\circ$ -interchange)

The following are examples of C -monoids.

Example 2.2. Recall from [19] that the pair $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathbb{3}^X)$ equipped with the action (46) for all $f, g \in \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{3}^X$ is a C -set. Note that $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ is treated as a pointed set with base point $\zeta_\perp$.

$$(46) \quad \alpha[f, g](x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = T; \\ g(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = F; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The C -set $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathbb{3}^X)$ equipped with the operation $\circ$ given in (36) and with $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ treated as a monoid with zero is in fact a C -monoid. For verification of axioms (37) – (45) refer to Appendix A.1. Such C -monoids will be called *functional C -monoids*.

Example 2.3. Let $S_\perp$ be a non-trivial monoid with identity 1 and zero $\perp$ and no non-zero zero-divisors, i.e., $s \cdot t = \perp \Rightarrow s = \perp$ or $t = \perp$. Then $S_\perp^X$ is also a monoid with zero for any set X with operations defined pointwise. For $f, g \in S_\perp^X$ define $(f \cdot g)(x) = f(x) \cdot g(x)$. The identity of $S_\perp^X$ is the constant function ζ_1 taking the value 1. The zero and base point of $S_\perp^X$ is the constant function $\zeta_\perp$ taking the value $\perp$. Recall from [19] that the pair $(S_\perp^X, \mathbb{3}^X)$ is a C -set under action (46). In fact it is also a C -monoid with $\circ$ defined as follows for all $f \in S_\perp^X$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{3}^X$:

$$(f \circ \alpha)(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha(x), & \text{if } f(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For verification of axioms (37) – (45) refer to Appendix A.2.

Example 2.4. Let $S_\perp$ be a non-trivial monoid with zero and no non-zero zero-divisors, i.e., $s \cdot t = \perp \Rightarrow s = \perp$ or $t = \perp$. In [19] the authors showed that for any

pointed set $S_\perp$ with base point $\perp$, the pair $(S_\perp, \mathfrak{Z})$ is a (basic) C -set with respect to the following action for all $a, b \in S_\perp$ and $\alpha \in \mathfrak{Z}$:

$$\alpha[a, b] = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } \alpha = T; \\ b, & \text{if } \alpha = F; \\ \perp, & \text{if } \alpha = U. \end{cases}$$

This basic C -set $(S_\perp, \mathfrak{Z})$ equipped with $\circ : S_\perp \times \mathfrak{Z} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}$ defined below for all $s \in S_\perp$ and $\alpha \in \mathfrak{Z}$ is a C -monoid.

$$s \circ \alpha = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } s \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{if } s = \perp. \end{cases}$$

For verification of axioms (37) – (45) refer to Appendix A.3.

3. REPRESENTATION OF A CLASS OF C -MONOIDS

In this section we obtain a Cayley-type theorem for a class of C -monoids as stated in the following main theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Every C -monoid $(S_\perp, M)$ where M is an ada is embeddable in the C -monoid $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathfrak{Z}^X)$ for some set X . Moreover, if both $S_\perp$ and M are finite then so is X .*

Sketch of the proof. For each maximal congruence θ of M , we consider the C -set congruence (E_θ, θ) of $(S_\perp, M)$. Corresponding to each such congruence, we construct a homomorphism of C -monoids from $(S_\perp, M)$ to the functional C -monoid over the set $S_\perp/E_\theta$. This collection of homomorphisms has the property that every distinct pair of elements from each component of the C -monoid will be separated by some homomorphism from this collection. We then set X to be the disjoint union of $S_\perp/E_\theta$'s excluding the equivalence class $\overline{\perp}^{E_\theta}$. We complete the proof by constructing a monomorphism – by pasting together each of the individual homomorphisms from the collection defined earlier – from the C -monoid $(S_\perp, M)$ to the functional C -monoid over the pointed set $X_\perp$ with a new base point $\perp$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be developed through various subsections. First in Subsection 3.1, we study some properties of maximal congruences of adas. We then present a collection of homomorphisms which separate every distinct pair of elements from each component of $(S_\perp, M)$ in Subsection 3.2. In Subsection 3.3, we construct the required functional C -monoid and establish an embedding from $(S_\perp, M)$. Finally, we consolidate the proof in Subsection 3.4.

In what follows $(S_\perp, M)$ is a C -monoid with M as an ada. Let θ be a maximal congruence on M and E_θ be the equivalence on $S_\perp$ as defined in Proposition 1.9 so that the pair (E_θ, θ) is a congruence on $(S_\perp, M)$. We denote the quotient set $S_\perp/E_\theta$ by $S_{\theta_\perp}$ and use S_θ to denote the set $S_{\theta_\perp} \setminus \{\overline{\perp}^{E_\theta}\}$. Further, we use q, s, t, u, v to denote elements of $S_\perp$ and α, β, γ to denote elements of the ada M .

3.1. Properties of maximal congruences. The following properties are useful in proving the main theorem.

Proposition 3.2. *No two elements of $\{T, F, U\}$ are related under θ . That is, $(T, F) \notin \theta$, $(T, U) \notin \theta$ and $(F, U) \notin \theta$.*

Proof. If $(T, F) \in \theta$ then we show that $\theta = M \times M$; contradicting the maximality of θ . Suppose $(T, F) \in \theta$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in M$. Then $(T, F), (\alpha, \alpha) \in \theta \Rightarrow (T \wedge \alpha, F \wedge \alpha) \in \theta$ that is $(\alpha, F) \in \theta$. Similarly $(\beta, F) \in \theta$ and so using the symmetry and transitivity of θ we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in \theta$ and consequently $\theta = M \times M$. The proof of $(T, U) \notin \theta$ follows along similar lines. Finally since $(F, U) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (T, U) \in \theta$, the result follows. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *For each $q \in S_\perp$, we have*

- (i) $(q \circ T)[q, \perp] = q$.
- (ii) $(q \circ T, F) \notin \theta$.
- (iii) $(q \circ T, U) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q, \perp) \in E_\theta$.
- (iv) $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q \circ F, F) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$.
- (v) $(s, t) \in E_\theta \Rightarrow (s \circ \alpha, t \circ \alpha) \in \theta$ for all $\alpha \in M$.
- (vi) $(1, \perp) \notin E_\theta$.

Proof.

- (i) Using (44) we have $q = q \cdot 1 = q \cdot T[1, \perp] = (q \circ T)[q \cdot 1, q \cdot \perp] = (q \circ T)[q, \perp]$.
- (ii) We prove the result by contradiction. Suppose $(q \circ T, F) \in \theta$. Using the fact that θ is a congruence on M and (40) we have $(q \circ T, F) \in \theta \Rightarrow (\neg(q \circ T), \neg F) \in \theta \Rightarrow (q \circ (\neg T), \neg F) \in \theta \Rightarrow (q \circ F, T) \in \theta$. Similarly using the fact that θ is a congruence, (41) and (40) we have $((q \circ F) \vee (q \circ T), (T \vee F)) \in \theta \Rightarrow (q \circ (F \vee T), (T \vee F)) \in \theta \Rightarrow (q \circ T, T) \in \theta$. Thus we have $(q \circ T, F) \in \theta$ and $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta$. From the symmetry and transitivity of θ it follows that $(T, F) \in \theta$, a contradiction by Proposition 3.2. The result follows.
- (iii) $(\Rightarrow)$ Let $(q \circ T, U) \in \theta$. Using Proposition 1.9(i) we can say that for any choice of $s, t \in S_\perp$ we have $((q \circ T)[s, t], \perp) \in E_\theta$. On choosing $s = q, t = \perp$ and using Proposition 3.3(i) we have $((q \circ T)[q, \perp], \perp) \in E_\theta$ that is $(q, \perp) \in E_\theta$ as desired.

$(\Leftarrow)$ First note that, for $\alpha \in M$,

$$(47) \quad \alpha[\perp, \perp] = \perp$$

(cf. [19, Proposition 2.8(1)]). Now assume that $(q, \perp) \in E_\theta$. Then there exists $\beta \in \overline{T}^\theta$ such that $\beta[q, \perp] = \beta[\perp, \perp]$. However, by (47), we have $\beta[q, \perp] = \perp$. Thus, $\beta[q, \perp] \circ T = \perp \circ T$ so that $\beta[q \circ T, \perp \circ T] = U$ (using (37) and (45)). Consequently, using (47) on (M, M) , we have $\beta[q \circ T, U] = \beta[U, U]$. Hence $(q \circ T, U) \in E_{\theta_M}$ and so from Proposition 1.9(iii), $(q \circ T, U) \in \theta$.

Thus $(q \circ T, U) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q, \perp) \in E_\theta$.

- (iv) We first show that $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q \circ F, F) \in \theta$ by making use of the substitution property of the congruence θ with respect to $\neg$, the fact that $\neg$ is an involution and (40). Thus $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (\neg(q \circ T), \neg T) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q \circ (\neg T), \neg T) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q \circ F, F) \in \theta$. Using Proposition 3.2, Proposition 3.3(ii) and Proposition 3.3(iii) we show the equivalence $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta \Leftrightarrow (q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$. We have $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta \Rightarrow (q \circ T, U) \notin \theta \Rightarrow (q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$. Conversely $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta \Rightarrow (q \circ T, U) \notin \theta$. Using Proposition 3.3(ii) it follows that $(q \circ T, F) \notin \theta$. Since θ is a maximal congruence the only remaining possibility is that $(q \circ T, T) \in \theta$ which completes the proof.
- (v) Consider $(s, t) \in E_\theta$ and $\alpha \in M$. Then there exists $\beta \in \overline{T}^\theta$ such that $\beta[s, t] = \beta[t, t]$. Thus $\beta[s, t] \circ \alpha = \beta[t, t] \circ \alpha$. Using (45) we have $\beta[s \circ \alpha, t \circ \alpha] = \beta[t \circ \alpha, t \circ \alpha]$ from which it follows that $(s \circ \alpha, t \circ \alpha) \in E_{\theta_M} \subseteq \theta$ by Proposition 1.9(iii).

- (vi) Suppose that $(1, \perp) \in E_\theta$. Using Proposition 3.3(v), (39), (37) we have $(1, \perp) \in E_\theta \Rightarrow (1 \circ T, \perp \circ T) \in \theta$ and so $(T, U) \in \theta$ a contradiction by Proposition 3.2.

□

3.2. A class of homomorphisms separating pairs of elements. For each maximal congruence θ on M , in this subsection, we present homomorphisms $\phi_\theta : S_\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp})$ and $\rho_\theta : M \rightarrow \mathbb{3}^{S_\theta}$. Then we establish that $(\phi_\theta, \rho_\theta)$ is a homomorphism from $(S_\perp, M)$ to the functional C -monoid $(\mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp}), \mathbb{3}^{S_\theta})$. Further, we ascertain that every pair of elements in $S_\perp$ (or M) are separated by some ϕ_θ (or ρ_θ).

Proposition 3.4. *The function $\phi_\theta : S_\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp})$ given by $\phi_\theta(s) = \psi_\theta^s$, where $\psi_\theta^s(\bar{t}^{E_\theta}) = \overline{t \cdot s^{E_\theta}}$, is a monoid homomorphism that maps the zero (and base point) of $S_\perp$ to that of $\mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp})$, that is $\perp \mapsto \zeta_\perp$.*

Proof. Claim: ϕ_θ is well-defined. It suffices to show that ψ_θ^s is well-defined and that $\psi_\theta^s \in \mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp})$, that is $\psi_\theta^s(\bar{\perp}) = \bar{\perp}$. In order to show the well-definedness of ψ_θ^s we consider $\bar{u} = \bar{t}$ that is $(u, t) \in E_\theta$. Then there exists $\beta \in \bar{T}^\theta$ such that $\beta[u, t] = \beta[t, t]$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \beta[u \cdot s, t \cdot s] &= \beta[u, t] \cdot s && \text{from (43)} \\ &= \beta[t, t] \cdot s \\ &= \beta[t \cdot s, t \cdot s] && \text{from (43)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(u \cdot s, t \cdot s) \in E_\theta$ and so $\psi_\theta^s(\bar{u}) = \psi_\theta^s(\bar{t})$. Also $\psi_\theta^s(\bar{\perp}) = \overline{\perp \cdot s} = \bar{\perp}$. Thus $\psi_\theta^s \in \mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp})$.

Claim: $\phi_\theta(\perp) = \zeta_\perp$. We have $\phi_\theta(\perp) = \psi_\theta^\perp$ where $\psi_\theta^\perp(\bar{t}) = \overline{\perp \cdot t} = \bar{\perp}$. Thus $\phi_\theta(\perp) = \zeta_\perp$.

Claim: $\phi_\theta(1) = id_{S_{\theta_\perp}}$. We have $\phi_\theta(1) = \psi_\theta^1$ where $\psi_\theta^1(\bar{t}) = \overline{t \cdot 1} = \bar{t}$.

Claim: ϕ_θ is a semigroup homomorphism. Consider $\phi_\theta(s \cdot t) = \psi_\theta^{s \cdot t}$ where $\psi_\theta^{s \cdot t}(\bar{u}) = \overline{u \cdot (s \cdot t)} = \overline{(u \cdot s) \cdot t} = \psi_\theta^t(\overline{u \cdot s}) = \psi_\theta^t(\psi_\theta^s(\bar{u})) = (\psi_\theta^s \cdot \psi_\theta^t)(\bar{u})$. Thus $\phi_\theta(s \cdot t) = \phi_\theta(s) \cdot \phi_\theta(t)$. □

Proposition 3.5. *The function $\rho_\theta : M \rightarrow \mathbb{3}^{S_\theta}$ given by*

$$\rho_\theta(\alpha) = \begin{cases} (S_\theta, \emptyset), & \text{if } \alpha = T; \\ (\emptyset, S_\theta), & \text{if } \alpha = F; \\ (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $A_\theta^\alpha = \{\bar{t}^{E_\theta} : t \circ \alpha \in \bar{T}^\theta\}$ and $B_\theta^\alpha = \{\bar{t}^{E_\theta} : t \circ \alpha \in \bar{F}^\theta\}$, is a homomorphism of C -algebras with T, F, U .

Proof. Claim: ρ_θ is well-defined. If $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$ then the proof is obvious. If $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$ then we show that $A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\alpha = \emptyset$ and that $A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha \subseteq S_\theta$, that is, $\bar{\perp} \notin A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha$. Let $\bar{t} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\alpha$. Then $t \circ \alpha \in \bar{T}^\theta$ and $t \circ \alpha \in \bar{F}^\theta$ and so $(T, F) \in \theta$ which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. Using (37) we have $\perp \circ \alpha = U$ and so if $\bar{\perp} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha$ we would have $\perp \circ \alpha = U \in \{\bar{T}^\theta, \bar{F}^\theta\}$, a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. Finally we show that the image under ρ_θ is independent of the representative of the equivalence class chosen. Using Proposition 3.3(v) we have $\bar{s} = \bar{t} \Rightarrow (s \circ \alpha, t \circ \alpha) \in \theta$. The result follows.

Claim: ρ_θ preserves the constants T, F, U . It is clear that $\rho_\theta(T) = (S_\theta, \emptyset)$, $\rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$ and, using (38) and Proposition 3.2, that $\rho_\theta(U) = (A_\theta^U, B_\theta^U) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ from which the result follows.

Claim: ρ_θ is a C -algebra homomorphism. We show that $\rho_\theta(\neg\alpha) = \neg(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$. If $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$ the proof is obvious. Suppose that $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$. Then we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_\theta(\neg\alpha) &= (A_\theta^{-\alpha}, B_\theta^{-\alpha}) \\
&= (\{\bar{t} : t \circ (\neg\alpha) \in \overline{T}^\theta\}, \{\bar{t} : t \circ (\neg\alpha) \in \overline{F}^\theta\}) \\
&= (\{\bar{t} : \neg(t \circ \alpha) \in \overline{T}^\theta\}, \{\bar{t} : \neg(t \circ \alpha) \in \overline{F}^\theta\}) && \text{using (40)} \\
&= (\{\bar{t} : t \circ \alpha \in \overline{F}^\theta\}, \{\bar{t} : t \circ \alpha \in \overline{T}^\theta\}) \\
&= (B_\theta^\alpha, A_\theta^\alpha) \\
&= \neg(\rho_\theta(\alpha))
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we show that $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)$. Note that the proof of $\rho_\theta(\alpha \vee \beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \vee \rho_\theta(\beta)$ follows using the double negation and De Morgan's laws, viz., (15) and (16) respectively in conjunction with the fact that ρ_θ preserves $\neg$ and $\wedge$. In order to prove that $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)$ we proceed by considering the following cases.

Case I: $\alpha, \beta \notin \{T, F\}$. We have the following subcases:

Subcase 1: $\alpha \wedge \beta \notin \{T, F\}$. Then $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = (A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}, B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta})$, $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha)$ and $\rho_\theta(\beta) = (A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\beta)$. Now $(A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) \wedge (A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\beta) = (A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta))$. Thus we have to show that

$$(A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}, B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}) = (A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)).$$

We show that the pairs of sets are equal componentwise.

Let $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}$. Then $q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) \in \overline{T}^\theta$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Rightarrow ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), T) \in \theta && \text{(using (41))} \\
&\Rightarrow ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta)), (q \circ \alpha) \wedge T) \in \theta && \text{(since } \theta \text{ is a congruence)} \\
&\Rightarrow ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), q \circ \alpha) \in \theta && \text{(using the properties of } \wedge) \\
&\Rightarrow (q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta && \text{(by transitivity of } \theta)
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha$. Along similar lines one can observe that

$$(((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta)) \wedge (q \circ \beta), T \wedge (q \circ \beta)) \in \theta.$$

Consequently $(q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$ so that $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\beta$. Hence $A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta} \subseteq A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta$.

For reverse inclusion let $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta$. Then $(q \circ \alpha, T), (q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$. Since θ is a congruence we have $((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), T \wedge T) = ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), T) = ((q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta)), T) \in \theta$ and so $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}$. Hence $A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta} = A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta$.

In order to show that $B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta} \subseteq B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$ consider $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}$ that is $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), F) \in \theta$. Since θ is a maximal congruence consider the following three possibilities:

$(q \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta$: Then clearly $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha$ and so $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$.

$(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$: Then we have $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha$. We show that $(q \circ \beta, F) \in \theta$. If this is not the case then either $(q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$ or $(q \circ \beta, U) \in \theta$. If $(q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$ then

since $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$ we have $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), T \wedge T) = (q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), T) \in \theta$ using (41) and the fact that θ is a congruence. However since $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), F) \in \theta$ we obtain a contradiction that $(T, F) \in \theta$ (cf. Proposition 3.2). Along similar lines if $(q \circ \beta, U) \in \theta$ then as $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$ we have $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), U) \in \theta$ and so $(F, U) \in \theta$ a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. Hence $(q \circ \beta, F) \in \theta$ so that $\bar{q} \in (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta) \subseteq B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$.

$(q \circ \alpha, U) \in \theta$: Since $(q \circ \beta, q \circ \beta) \in \theta$ we have $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), U \wedge q \circ \beta) = (q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), U) \in \theta$ using (41) and the fact that θ is a congruence. However since $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), F) \in \theta$ we have $(F, U) \in \theta$ a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. Thus this case cannot occur.

To show the reverse inclusion let $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$ that is $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha$ or $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta$. If $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha$ then $(q \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow & ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), F \wedge (q \circ \beta)) \in \theta && \text{(since } \theta \text{ is a congruence)} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), F \wedge (q \circ \beta)) \in \theta && \text{(using (41))} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), F) \in \theta && \text{(since } F \text{ is a left-zero for } \wedge) \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}$. In the case where $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta$ that is $(q \circ \alpha, T), (q \circ \beta, F) \in \theta$, along similar lines it follows that $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), T \wedge F) = (q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), F) \in \theta$ and so $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta}$. Therefore $B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge \beta} = B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$.

Subcase 2: $\alpha \wedge \beta \in \{T, F\}$. Using the fact that $M \leq 3^X$ for some set X it is easy to see that if $\alpha, \beta \notin \{T, F\}$ then $\alpha \wedge \beta \neq T$. It follows that the only possibility in this case is that $\alpha \wedge \beta = F$. Therefore $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$ and $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta) = (A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta))$ and so we have to show that

$$(\emptyset, S_\theta) = (A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)).$$

We first show that $A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta = \emptyset$. If $A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta \neq \emptyset$ then let $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta$ so that $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta, (q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow & ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), T \wedge T) = ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), T) \in \theta && \text{(since } \theta \text{ is a congruence)} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), T) \in \theta && \text{(using (41))} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ F, T) \in \theta && \text{(since } \alpha \wedge \beta = F) \\ \Rightarrow & (\neg(q \circ F), \neg T) = (\neg(q \circ F), F) \in \theta && \text{(since } \theta \text{ is a congruence)} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ \neg F, F) = (q \circ T, F) \in \theta && \text{(using (40))} \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii). Hence $A_\theta^\alpha \cap A_\theta^\beta = \emptyset$.

In order to show that $B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta) = S_\theta$ consider $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$ that is $\bar{q} \neq \perp$ which gives $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$. We proceed by considering the following three cases:

$(q \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta$: Then it is clear that $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha \subseteq B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$.

$(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$: Then we have $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha$. We show that $(q \circ \beta, F) \in \theta$. Suppose that this is not the case. Since θ is a maximal congruence it implies that either $(q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$ or $(q \circ \beta, U) \in \theta$. If $(q \circ \beta, T) \in \theta$ then since $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$ it follows that $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), T \wedge T) = (q \circ F, T) \in \theta$ so that $(q \circ T, F) \in \theta$. This is a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii). In the case that $(q \circ \beta, U) \in \theta$ proceeding as earlier we have $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), T \wedge U) = (q \circ F, U) \in \theta$ so that $(q \circ T, U) \in \theta$. It follows from Proposition 3.3(iii) that $(q, \perp) \in E_\theta$ which is a contradiction to the assumption that $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$. Consequently it must be

the case that $(q \circ \beta, F) \in \theta$ so that $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta \subseteq B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (q \circ \alpha, U) \in \theta: \text{ Since } \theta \text{ is a congruence we have } (q \circ \beta, q \circ \beta) \in \theta \\
\Rightarrow & ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ \beta), U \wedge (q \circ \beta)) \in \theta \quad (\text{since } \theta \text{ is a congruence}) \\
\Rightarrow & ((q \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta), U) = (q \circ F, U) \in \theta \quad (\text{since } U \text{ is a left-zero for } \wedge \text{ and using (41)}) \\
\Rightarrow & (\neg(q \circ F), \neg U) \in \theta \quad (\text{since } \theta \text{ is a congruence}) \\
\Rightarrow & (q \circ \neg F, \neg U) = (q \circ T, U) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (40)})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus using Proposition 3.3(iii) we have $(q, \perp) \in E_\theta$ which is a contradiction to the assumption that $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$. Hence this case cannot occur.

Thus $B_\theta^\alpha \cup (A_\theta^\alpha \cap B_\theta^\beta) = S_\theta$ which completes the proof in the case where $\alpha, \beta \notin \{T, F\}$.

Case II: $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$. The verification is straightforward by considering $\alpha = T$ and $\alpha = F$ casewise.

Subcase 1: $\alpha = T$. Then $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(T \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(\beta) = (S_\theta, \emptyset) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta) = \rho_\theta(T) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)$.

Subcase 2: $\alpha = F$. Then $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(F \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta) = (\emptyset, S_\theta) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta) = \rho_\theta(F) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)$.

Case III: $\beta \in \{T, F\}$. We have the following subcases:

Subcase 1: $\beta = T$. The proof follows along the same lines as *Case II* above since T is the left and right-identity for $\wedge$. Thus $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge T) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge (S_\theta, \emptyset) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(T) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)$.

Subcase 2: $\beta = F$. If $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$ then this reduces to *Case II* proved above and consequently we have $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)$ in this case. Thus it remains to consider the case where $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$. We then have the following subcases depending on $\alpha \wedge \beta$:

$\alpha \wedge \beta \notin \{T, F\}$: Then $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge F) = (A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}, B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F})$ while $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha)$ and $\rho_\theta(\beta) = \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$. Thus $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta) = (\emptyset, A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha)$. We show that

$$(A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}, B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}) = (\emptyset, A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha)$$

as earlier by proving that the pairs of sets are equal componentwise.

We show that $A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F} = \emptyset$ by contradiction. If $A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F} \neq \emptyset$ then consider $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}$. It follows that $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge F), T) \in \theta$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Rightarrow & ((q \circ (\alpha \wedge F)) \wedge (q \circ F), T \wedge q \circ F) \in \theta \quad (\text{since } \theta \text{ is a congruence}) \\
\Rightarrow & ((q \circ (\alpha \wedge F)) \wedge (q \circ F), q \circ F) \in \theta \quad (\text{since } T \text{ is a left-identity for } \wedge) \\
\Rightarrow & (((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ F)) \wedge (q \circ F), q \circ F) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (41)}) \\
\Rightarrow & ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ F), q \circ F) \in \theta \quad (\text{using the properties of } \wedge) \\
\Rightarrow & (q \circ F, T) \in \theta \quad (\text{since } \theta \text{ is a congruence}) \\
\Rightarrow & (q \circ T, F) \in \theta \quad (\text{from (40) and since } \theta \text{ is a congruence})
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii). Hence $A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F} = \emptyset$.

We show that $B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F} = A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha$ using standard set theoretic arguments. Let $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}$ and so $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge F), F) \in \theta$ so that $((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ F), F) \in \theta$. In view of the maximality of θ it suffices to consider three cases. If either $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$ or $(q \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta$ then $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha$. If $(q \circ \alpha, U) \in \theta$ then $((q \circ \alpha) \wedge ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ F)), U \wedge F) = ((q \circ \alpha) \wedge (q \circ F), U) \in \theta$. Thus $(F, U) \in \theta$ which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. Hence this case cannot occur and so $B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F} \subseteq A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha$.

For the reverse inclusion consider $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha$ so that $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha$ or $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha$. If $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha$ then $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$. Since $\bar{q} \in A_\theta^\alpha \subseteq S_\theta$ using Proposition 3.3(iv) we have $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta \Rightarrow (q \circ F, F) \in \theta$. Consequently $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge F), (T \wedge F)) = (q \circ (\alpha \wedge F), F) \in \theta$ and so $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}$. Along similar lines if $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^\alpha$ we have $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge F), F) \in \theta$ so that $\bar{q} \in B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}$. Hence $(A_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}, B_\theta^{\alpha \wedge F}) = (\emptyset, A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha)$.

$\alpha \wedge \beta \in \{T, F\}$: Using the fact that $M \leq \mathfrak{Z}^X$ for some set X we have $\alpha \wedge F \neq T$ from which it follows that the only case is $\alpha \wedge \beta = \alpha \wedge F = F$. Thus $\rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge F) = \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$ while $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha)$. We show that

$$(\emptyset, S_\theta) = (\emptyset, A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha).$$

In order to show that $A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha = S_\theta$ consider $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$. If $(q \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$ or $(q \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta$ then the proof is complete. If $(q \circ \alpha, U) \in \theta$ then since $\bar{q} \neq \perp$ that is $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$ by Proposition 3.3(iv) we have $(q \circ F, F) \in \theta$. Thus $(q \circ (\alpha \wedge F), U \wedge F) = (q \circ F, U) \in \theta$. Consequently from the transitivity of θ it follows that $(F, U) \in \theta$ which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. Hence $(\emptyset, S_\theta) = (\emptyset, A_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\theta^\alpha)$.

Thus ρ_θ is a homomorphism of C -algebras with T, F, U . $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *The pair $(\phi_\theta, \rho_\theta)$ is a C -monoid homomorphism from $(S_\perp, M)$ to the functional C -monoid $(\mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp}), \mathfrak{Z}^{S_\theta})$.*

Proof. In view of Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.5 it suffices to show that $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t]) = \rho_\theta(\alpha)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)]$ and $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha)$ hold. In order to show that $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t]) = \rho_\theta(\alpha)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)]$ we proceed casewise depending on the value of α as per the following:

Case I: $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$. If $\alpha = T$ then $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t]) = \phi_\theta(T[s, t]) = \phi_\theta(s) = (S_\theta, \emptyset)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)] = \rho_\theta(T)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)] = \rho_\theta(\alpha)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)]$. Along similar lines if $\alpha = F$ then $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t]) = \phi_\theta(F[s, t]) = \phi_\theta(t) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)] = \rho_\theta(F)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)] = \rho_\theta(\alpha)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)]$.

Case II: $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$. If $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$ then using (44) we have $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t]) = \psi_\theta^{\alpha[s, t]}$ where $\psi_\theta^{\alpha[s, t]}(\bar{v}) = \overline{v \cdot (\alpha[s, t])} = \overline{(v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t]}$. Consider $\rho_\theta(\alpha)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)] = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha)[\psi_\theta^s, \psi_\theta^t]$, where

$$(A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha)[\psi_\theta^s, \psi_\theta^t](\bar{v}) = \begin{cases} \overline{v \cdot s}, & \text{if } \bar{v} \in A_\theta^\alpha, \text{ that is } (v \circ \alpha) \in \overline{T}^\theta; \\ \overline{v \cdot t}, & \text{if } \bar{v} \in B_\theta^\alpha \text{ that is } (v \circ \alpha) \in \overline{F}^\theta; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It suffices to consider the following three cases:

Subcase 1: $(v \circ \alpha) \in \overline{T}^\theta$. using Proposition 1.9(i) we have $((v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t], v \cdot s) \in E_\theta$. Consequently $\overline{(v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t]} = \overline{v \cdot s}$.

Subcase 2: $(v \circ \alpha) \in \overline{F}^\theta$. Along similar lines if $(v \circ \alpha) \in \overline{F}^\theta$ then $((v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t], v \cdot t) \in E_\theta$, by Proposition 1.9(i) and so $\overline{(v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t]} = \overline{v \cdot t}$.

Subcase 3: $(v \circ \alpha) \in \overline{U}^\theta$. Then $((v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t], \perp) \in E_\theta$, by Proposition 1.9(i) which gives $\overline{(v \circ \alpha)[v \cdot s, v \cdot t]} = \overline{\perp}$.

Thus we have $\psi_\theta^{\alpha[s, t]}(\overline{v}) = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha)[\psi_\theta^s, \psi_\theta^t](\overline{v})$ for every $\overline{v} \in S_{\theta \perp}$ and so $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t]) = \rho_\theta(\alpha)[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)]$.

We show that $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha)$ by proceeding casewise depending on the value of α and $s \circ \alpha$.

Case I: $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}, s \circ \alpha \notin \{T, F\}$. Then $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = (A_\theta^{s \circ \alpha}, B_\theta^{s \circ \alpha})$ and $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha)$. Then $\phi_\theta(s) \circ (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) = \psi_\theta^s \circ (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) = (C, D)$, where $C = \{\overline{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\overline{q}) \in A_\theta^\alpha\}$ and $D = \{\overline{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\overline{q}) \in B_\theta^\alpha\}$. We have to show that

$$(A_\theta^{s \circ \alpha}, B_\theta^{s \circ \alpha}) = (C, D).$$

It is clear that $\overline{q} \in C$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Leftrightarrow \psi_\theta^s(\overline{q}) \in A_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \overline{q \cdot s} \in A_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta \\ &\Leftrightarrow (q \circ (s \circ \alpha), T) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \overline{q} \in A_\theta^{s \circ \alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Along similar lines we have $\overline{q} \in D \Leftrightarrow \overline{q} \in B_\theta^{s \circ \alpha}$.

Case II: $\alpha \in \{T, F\}, s \circ \alpha \notin \{T, F\}$. If $\alpha = T$ then $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \rho_\theta(s \circ T) = (A_\theta^{s \circ T}, B_\theta^{s \circ T})$. On the other hand $\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha) = \phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(T) = \psi_\theta^s \circ (S_\theta, \emptyset) = (C, D)$ where $C = \{\overline{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\overline{q}) \in S_\theta\}$ and $D = \emptyset$. We have to show that

$$(A_\theta^{s \circ T}, B_\theta^{s \circ T}) = (C, \emptyset).$$

We show that $B_\theta^{s \circ T} = \emptyset$ by contradiction. If $B_\theta^{s \circ T} \neq \emptyset$ then let $\overline{q} \in B_\theta^{s \circ T}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow (q \circ (s \circ T), F) \in \theta \\ &\Rightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ T, F) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii). Thus $B_\theta^{s \circ T} = \emptyset$.

We now show that $A_\theta^{s \circ T} = C$. It is clear that $\overline{q} \in C$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Leftrightarrow \psi_\theta^s(\overline{q}) \in S_\theta \\ &\Leftrightarrow \overline{q \cdot s} \in S_\theta \\ &\Leftrightarrow (q \cdot s, \perp) \notin E_\theta \\ &\Leftrightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ T, T) \in \theta \quad (\text{using Proposition 3.3(iv)}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (q \circ (s \circ T), T) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \overline{q} \in A_\theta^{s \circ T} \end{aligned}$$

In the case where $\alpha = F$ the proof follows along similar lines.

Case III: $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}, s \circ \alpha \in \{T, F\}$. We have the following subcases:

Subcase 1: $s \circ \alpha = T$. Then $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \rho_\theta(T) = (S_\theta, \emptyset)$. On the other hand $\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha) = \psi_\theta^s \circ (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) = (C, D)$ where $C = \{\bar{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in A_\theta^\alpha\}$ and $D = \{\bar{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in B_\theta^\alpha\}$. We have to show that

$$(C, D) = (S_\theta, \emptyset).$$

We first show by contradiction that $D = \emptyset$. If $D \neq \emptyset$ consider $\bar{q} \in D$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in B_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q} \cdot s \in B_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ (s \circ \alpha), F) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ T, F) \in \theta \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii).

In order to show that $C = S_\theta$ consider $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$ that is $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow (q \circ T, T) \in \theta \quad (\text{using Proposition 3.3(iv)}) \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ (s \circ \alpha), T) \in \theta \\ &\Rightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q} \cdot s \in A_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in A_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q} \in C. \end{aligned}$$

Subcase 2: $s \circ \alpha = F$. Then $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$ while $\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha) = \psi_\theta^s \circ (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) = (C, D)$ where $C = \{\bar{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in A_\theta^\alpha\}$ and $D = \{\bar{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in B_\theta^\alpha\}$. We have to show that

$$(C, D) = (\emptyset, S_\theta).$$

We first show $C = \emptyset$ by contradiction. If $C \neq \emptyset$ consider $\bar{q} \in C$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in A_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q} \cdot s \in A_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ (s \circ \alpha), T) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ F, T) \in \theta \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ T, F) \in \theta \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii).

In order to show that $D = S_\theta$ consider $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$ that is $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow (q \circ F, F) \in \theta \quad (\text{using Proposition 3.3(iv)}) \\ &\Rightarrow (q \circ (s \circ \alpha), F) \in \theta \\ &\Rightarrow ((q \cdot s) \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta \quad (\text{using (42)}) \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q} \cdot s \in B_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in B_\theta^\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q} \in D \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof for the case where $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$ and $s \circ \alpha \in \{T, F\}$.

Case IV: $\alpha \in \{T, F\}, s \circ \alpha \in \{T, F\}$. Note that $s \circ T \neq F$ as a consequence of Proposition 3.3(ii). If $s \circ T = F$ then as θ is a congruence, $(F, F) \in \theta \Rightarrow (s \circ T, F) \in \theta$,

a contradiction to Proposition 3.3(ii). Similarly we have $s \circ F \neq T$. In view of the above it suffices to consider the following cases:

Subcase 1: $\alpha = T, s \circ \alpha = T$. Then $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \rho_\theta(T) = (S_\theta, \emptyset)$ and $\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha) = \psi_\theta^s \circ (S_\theta, \emptyset) = (C, D)$ where $C = \{\bar{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in S_\theta\}$ and $D = \emptyset$. Thus it suffices to show that $C = S_\theta$. Let $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$ that is $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow & (q \circ T, T) \in \theta && \text{(using Proposition 3.3(iv))} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ (s \circ T), T) \in \theta \\ \Rightarrow & ((q \cdot s) \circ T, T) \in \theta && \text{(using (42))} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \cdot s, \perp) \notin E_\theta && \text{(using Proposition 3.3(iv))} \\ \Rightarrow & \overline{q \cdot s} \in S_\theta \\ \Rightarrow & \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in S_\theta \\ \Rightarrow & \bar{q} \in C. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $C = S_\theta$.

Subcase 2: $\alpha = F, s \circ \alpha = F$. Then $\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha) = \rho_\theta(F) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$ and $\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha) = \psi_\theta^s \circ (\emptyset, S_\theta) = (C, D)$ where $C = \emptyset$ and $D = \{\bar{q} \in S_\theta : \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in S_\theta\}$. The proof follows along similar lines as above. In order to show that $D = S_\theta$ consider $\bar{q} \in S_\theta$ that is $(q, \perp) \notin E_\theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow & (q \circ F, F) \in \theta && \text{(using Proposition 3.3(iv))} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \circ (s \circ F), F) \in \theta \\ \Rightarrow & ((q \cdot s) \circ F, F) \in \theta && \text{(using (42))} \\ \Rightarrow & (q \cdot s, \perp) \notin E_\theta && \text{(using Proposition 3.3(iv))} \\ \Rightarrow & \overline{q \cdot s} \in S_\theta \\ \Rightarrow & \psi_\theta^s(\bar{q}) \in S_\theta \\ \Rightarrow & \bar{q} \in D. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $D = S_\theta$ which completes the proof.

Thus $(\phi_\theta, \rho_\theta)$ is a homomorphism of C -monoids. $\square$

Proposition 3.7. *For all $\alpha \in M$ the following statements hold:*

- (i) $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (S_\theta, \emptyset) \Rightarrow (\alpha, T) \in \theta$.
- (ii) $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (\emptyset, S_\theta) \Rightarrow (\alpha, F) \in \theta$.

Proof.

- (i) If $\alpha = T$ then the result is obvious. Suppose that $\alpha \neq T$ and $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) = (S_\theta, \emptyset)$. It follows that $(t \circ \alpha, T) \in \theta$ for all $\bar{t} \in S_\theta$. Using Proposition 3.3(vi) and (39) we have $\bar{1} \in S_\theta$ and so $(1 \circ \alpha, T) = (\alpha, T) \in \theta$.
- (ii) Along similar lines if $\alpha \neq F$ then $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = (A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) = (\emptyset, S_\theta)$ gives $(t \circ \alpha, F) \in \theta$ for all $\bar{t} \in S_\theta$. Using Proposition 3.3(vi) and (39) we have $\bar{1} \in S_\theta$ and so $(1 \circ \alpha, F) = (\alpha, F) \in \theta$. $\square$

Lemma 3.8. *For every $s, t \in S_\perp$ where $s \neq t$ there exists a maximal congruence θ on M such that $\phi_\theta(s) \neq \phi_\theta(t)$.*

Proof. Using Proposition 1.9(iv) we have $\bigcap E_\theta = \Delta_{S_\perp}$ and so since $s \neq t$ there exists a maximal congruence θ on M such that $(s, t) \notin E_\theta$, i.e., $\bar{s} \neq \bar{t}$. For this θ , consider $\phi_\theta : S_\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_o(S_{\theta_\perp})$. Then $\phi_\theta(s) = \psi_\theta^s, \phi_\theta(t) = \psi_\theta^t$. For $\bar{1} \in S_{\theta_\perp}$

we have $\psi_\theta^s(\bar{1}) = \overline{1 \cdot s} = \bar{s}$ while $\psi_\theta^t(\bar{1}) = \overline{1 \cdot t} = \bar{t}$. Since $\bar{s} \neq \bar{t}$ it follows that $\phi_\theta(s) \neq \phi_\theta(t)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.9. *For every $\alpha, \beta \in M$ where $\alpha \neq \beta$ there exists a maximal congruence θ on M such that $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \neq \rho_\theta(\beta)$.*

Proof. Using Proposition 1.9(v) since $\alpha \neq \beta$ there exists a maximal congruence θ on M such that $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \theta$. We show that $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \neq \rho_\theta(\beta)$. If α or β is in $\{T, F\}$ but $\rho_\theta(\alpha) = \rho_\theta(\beta)$ then using Proposition 3.7 we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in \theta$, a contradiction. In the case where $\alpha, \beta \notin \{T, F\}$ we show that

$$(A_\theta^\alpha, B_\theta^\alpha) \neq (A_\theta^\beta, B_\theta^\beta)$$

by showing that either $A_\theta^\alpha \neq A_\theta^\beta$ or that $B_\theta^\alpha \neq B_\theta^\beta$. Owing to Proposition 3.2 it suffices to consider the following three cases:

Case I: $(\alpha, T) \in \theta$. Note that Proposition 3.3(vi) gives $\bar{1} \in S_\theta$. Thus we have $\bar{1} \in S_\theta$ for which $1 \circ \alpha = \alpha \in \bar{T}^\theta$ and so $\bar{1} \in A_\theta^\alpha$. However $\bar{1} \notin A_\theta^\beta$ since $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \theta$.

Case II: $(\alpha, F) \in \theta$. Along similar lines for $\bar{1} \in S_\theta$ we have $1 \circ \alpha = \alpha \in \bar{F}^\theta$ and so $\bar{1} \in B_\theta^\alpha$. It is clear that $\bar{1} \notin B_\theta^\beta$ since $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \theta$.

Case III: $(\alpha, U) \in \theta$. In view of Proposition 3.2 it suffices to consider the following cases:

Subcase 1: $(\beta, T) \in \theta$. As earlier we have $\bar{1} \in A_\theta^\beta \setminus A_\theta^\alpha$.

Subcase 2: $(\beta, F) \in \theta$. It is clear that $\bar{1} \in B_\theta^\beta \setminus B_\theta^\alpha$.

Thus $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \neq \rho_\theta(\beta)$ which completes the proof. $\square$

3.3. Embedding into a functional C -monoid. Let $\{\theta\}$ be the collection of all maximal congruences of M . Define the set X to be the disjoint union of S_θ taken over all maximal congruences of M , written

$$(48) \quad X = \bigsqcup_{\theta} S_\theta$$

Set $X_\perp = X \cup \{\perp\}$ with base point $\perp \notin X$. For notational convenience we use the same symbol $\perp$ in $X_\perp$ as well as in $S_\perp$. Which $\perp$ we are referring to will be clear from the context of the statement.

In this subsection we obtain monomorphisms $\phi : S_\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ and $\rho : M \rightarrow \mathbb{3}^X$, using which we establish that $(S_\perp, M)$ can be embedded into the functional C -monoid $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathbb{3}^X)$.

Remark 3.10.

- (i) Let $q \in S$ be fixed. For different θ 's the representation of classes $\bar{q}^{E_\theta}$'s are different in the disjoint union X of S_θ 's.
- (ii) Let $\{A_\lambda\}, \{B_\lambda\}$ be two families of sets indexed over Λ . Then $\bigsqcup_{\lambda} (A_\lambda \cap B_\lambda) =$

$$\left(\bigsqcup_{\lambda} A_\lambda \right) \cap \left(\bigsqcup_{\lambda} B_\lambda \right) \text{ and } \bigsqcup_{\lambda} (A_\lambda \cup B_\lambda) = \left(\bigsqcup_{\lambda} A_\lambda \right) \cup \left(\bigsqcup_{\lambda} B_\lambda \right).$$

Notation 3.11.

- (i) For the pair of sets (A, B) , we denote by $\pi_1(A, B)$ the first component A , and by $\pi_2(A, B)$ the second component B .

(ii) For a family of pairs of sets (A_λ, B_λ) where $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we denote by $\bigsqcup_\lambda (A_\lambda, B_\lambda)$

the pair of sets $\left(\bigsqcup_\lambda A_\lambda, \bigsqcup_\lambda B_\lambda\right)$.

Lemma 3.12. *Consider $\phi : S_\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ given by*

$$(\phi(s))(x) = \begin{cases} (\phi_\theta(s))(\overline{q}^{E_\theta}), & \text{if } x = \overline{q}^{E_\theta} \in S_\theta \text{ and } (\phi_\theta(s))(\overline{q}^{E_\theta}) \neq \overline{1}^{E_\theta}; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then ϕ is a monoid monomorphism that maps the zero (and base point) of $S_\perp$ to that of $\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$, that is $\perp \mapsto \zeta_\perp$.

Proof. It is clear that ϕ is well-defined and that $\phi(s) \in \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ since $(\phi(s))(\perp) = \perp$.

Claim: ϕ is injective. Let $s \neq t \in S_\perp$. Using Lemma 3.8 there exists a maximal congruence θ on M such that $\phi_\theta(s) \neq \phi_\theta(t)$. Hence there exists a $\overline{q}^{E_\theta} (\neq \overline{1}^{E_\theta})$ such that $(\phi_\theta(s))(\overline{q}) \neq (\phi_\theta(t))(\overline{q})$. By extrapolation it follows that $(\phi(s))(\overline{q}) \neq (\phi(t))(\overline{q})$ and so $\phi(s) \neq \phi(t)$.

Claim: $\phi(\perp) = \zeta_\perp$. Using Proposition 3.4 we have $\phi_\theta(\perp) = \zeta_{\overline{1}^{E_\theta}}$ for all θ and so by definition $(\phi(\perp))(x) = \perp$ for all $x \in X_\perp$.

Claim: $\phi(1) = id_{X_\perp}$. It is clear that $(\phi(1))(\perp) = \perp$. Consider $\overline{q} \in X$ that is $\overline{q}^{E_\theta} \in S_\theta$ for some θ . Then by Proposition 3.4 we have $(\phi(1))(\overline{q}^{E_\theta}) = (\phi_\theta(1))(\overline{q}^{E_\theta}) = \overline{q}^{E_\theta}$ and hence $\phi(1) = id_{X_\perp}$.

Claim: $\phi(s \cdot t) = \phi(s) \cdot \phi(t)$. Clearly $(\phi(s \cdot t))(\perp) = \perp = (\phi(s) \cdot \phi(t))(\perp)$. Let $\overline{q} \in X$ that is $\overline{q}^{E_\theta} \in S_\theta$ for some θ . Suppose that $(\phi(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) = \perp$ so that $(\phi_\theta(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) = \overline{1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow & ((\phi_\theta(s) \cdot \phi_\theta(t))(\overline{q}) = \overline{1} \quad (\text{using Proposition 3.4}) \\ \Rightarrow & \phi_\theta(t)(\phi_\theta(s)(\overline{q})) = \overline{1} \\ \Rightarrow & \phi(t)(\phi_\theta(s)(\overline{q})) = \perp \end{aligned}$$

Noting that there are only two possibilities for $\phi(s)(\overline{q})$ we see that if $\phi(s)(\overline{q}) = \phi_\theta(s)(\overline{q})$ then we are through. On the other hand if $\phi(s)(\overline{q}) = \perp$ that is $\phi_\theta(s)(\overline{q}) = \overline{1}$ then we have $(\phi(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) = \perp = (\phi(s) \cdot \phi(t))(\overline{q})$ which completes the proof in this case.

Consider the case where $(\phi(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) \neq \perp$. Using Proposition 3.4 it follows that $(\phi(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) = (\phi_\theta(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) = (\phi_\theta(s) \cdot \phi_\theta(t))(\overline{q}) = \phi_\theta(t)(\phi_\theta(s)(\overline{q}))$ and so $(\phi_\theta(s))(\overline{q}) \neq \overline{1}$. Consequently $\phi(t)(\phi(s)(\overline{q})) = \phi_\theta(t)(\phi_\theta(s)(\overline{q}))$ since $(\phi_\theta(s))(\overline{q}) \neq \overline{1}$. It follows that $(\phi(s \cdot t))(\overline{q}) = (\phi(s) \cdot \phi(t))(\overline{q})$ which completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.13. *The function $\rho : M \rightarrow \mathbb{3}^X$ defined by*

$$\rho(\alpha) = \sqcup_\theta \rho_\theta(\alpha)$$

is a monomorphism of C-algebras with T, F, U .

Proof. *Claim: ρ is well defined.* Let $\alpha \in M$. Using Remark 3.10(i) we have $\pi_1(\rho(\alpha)) \cap \pi_2(\rho(\alpha)) = \emptyset$ due to the distinct representation of equivalence classes. Also by Proposition 3.5 we have $\pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)), \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \subseteq S_\theta$ and so $\perp \notin \pi_1(\rho(\alpha)) \cup \pi_2(\rho(\alpha))$ that is $\rho(\alpha)$ can be identified with a pair of sets over X .

Claim: ρ is injective. Let $\alpha \neq \beta \in M$. By Lemma 3.9 there exists a θ such that $\rho_\theta(\alpha) \neq \rho_\theta(\beta)$. Without loss of generality we infer that there exists a $\bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \setminus \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\beta))$. Since $\rho(\alpha)$ is formed by taking the disjoint union of the individual images under $\rho_\theta(\alpha)$, using Remark 3.10(i) we can say that $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho(\alpha)) \setminus \pi_1(\rho(\beta))$ that is $\rho(\alpha) \neq \rho(\beta)$.

Claim: ρ preserves the constants T, F, U . It follows easily from Proposition 3.5 that $\rho(T) = (X, \emptyset)$, $\rho(F) = (\emptyset, X)$ and $\rho(U) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.

Claim: $\rho(\neg\alpha) = \neg(\rho(\alpha))$. If $\alpha \in \{T, F\}$ then the result is obvious. If $\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$ then $\neg\alpha \notin \{T, F\}$. Using Proposition 3.5 we have $\rho(\neg\alpha) = (\sqcup A_\theta^{\neg\alpha}, \sqcup B_\theta^{\neg\alpha}) = (\sqcup B_\theta^\alpha, \sqcup A_\theta^\alpha)$. Thus $\rho(\neg\alpha) = (\sqcup B_\theta^\alpha, \sqcup A_\theta^\alpha) = \neg(\rho(\alpha))$.

Claim: $\rho(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \rho(\alpha) \wedge \rho(\beta)$. In view of Remark 3.10(ii) we have $\sqcup((A_\lambda, B_\lambda) \wedge (C_\lambda, D_\lambda)) = (\sqcup A_\lambda, \sqcup B_\lambda) \wedge (\sqcup C_\lambda, \sqcup D_\lambda)$ for the family of pairs of sets $(A_\lambda, B_\lambda), (C_\lambda, D_\lambda)$ where $\lambda \in \Lambda$ over X . In view of the above and Proposition 3.5 we have $\sqcup \rho_\theta(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \sqcup(\rho_\theta(\alpha) \wedge \rho_\theta(\beta)) = (\sqcup \rho_\theta(\alpha)) \wedge (\sqcup \rho_\theta(\beta)) = \rho(\alpha) \wedge \rho(\beta)$ which completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.14. *The pair (ϕ, ρ) is a C -monoid monomorphism from $(S_\perp, M)$ to the functional C -monoid $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathbb{3}^X)$.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 3.12 and Lemma 3.13 it suffices to show $\phi(\alpha[s, t]) = (\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)]$ and $\rho(s \circ \alpha) = \phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha)$.

In order to show that $\phi(\alpha[s, t]) = (\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)]$ we show that $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(x) = (\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](x)$ for all $x \in X_\perp$. Thus we have the following cases:

Case I: $x = \perp$. It is clear that $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\perp) = \perp = (\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](\perp)$ since $\pi_1(\rho(\alpha)), \pi_2(\rho(\alpha)) \subseteq X$ and $\perp \notin X$.

Case II: $x \in X$. Consider $\bar{q} \in X$ that is $\bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in S_\theta$ for some θ . We have the following subcases:

Subcase 1: $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = \perp$. then $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = \overline{\perp}$ and so using Lemma 3.6 we have $\phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = \overline{\perp} = (\rho_\theta(\alpha))[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)](\bar{q})$. It follows that either $\bar{q} \notin \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \cup \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$ or that $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$ and $\phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}) = \overline{\perp}$ or, similarly, that $\bar{q} \in \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$ and $\phi_\theta(t)(\bar{q}) = \overline{\perp}$. Thus we have the following:

$\bar{q} \notin \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \cup \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$: In view of Remark 3.10(i) it follows that $\bar{q} \notin \pi_1(\rho(\alpha)) \cup \pi_2(\rho(\alpha))$ and so $(\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](\bar{q}) = \perp$.
 $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$ and $\phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}) = \overline{\perp}$: Then $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho(\alpha))$ and $\phi(s)(\bar{q}) = \perp$ and so $(\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](\bar{q}) = \perp$.
 $\bar{q} \in \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$ and $\phi_\theta(t)(\bar{q}) = \overline{\perp}$: Along similar lines we have $(\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](\bar{q}) = \perp$.

Subcase 2: $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) \neq \perp$. Then $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = \phi_\theta(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q})$ and so using Lemma 3.6 we have $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = (\rho_\theta(\alpha))[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)](\bar{q})$. It follows that

$$\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = (\rho_\theta(\alpha))[\phi_\theta(s), \phi_\theta(t)](\bar{q}) = \begin{cases} \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}), & \text{if } \bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)); \\ \phi_\theta(t)(\bar{q}), & \text{if } \bar{q} \in \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha)); \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$: It follows that $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho(\alpha))$ and so $(\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](\bar{q}) = \phi(s)(\bar{q})$. Note that $\phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}) \neq \perp$ else $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = \perp$, a contradiction.

Thus $\phi(s)(\bar{q}) = \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q})$ so that $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) = (\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)](\bar{q})$.

$\bar{q} \in \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha))$: The proof follows along similar lines as above.

$\bar{q} \notin (\pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \cup \pi_2(\rho_\theta(\alpha)))$: This case cannot occur since we assumed that $\phi(\alpha[s, t])(\bar{q}) \neq \perp$.

Thus $\phi(\alpha[s, t]) = (\rho(\alpha))[\phi(s), \phi(t)]$.

We now show that $\rho(s \circ \alpha) = \phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha)$. In order to prove this we proceed by showing that

$$\pi_i(\rho(s \circ \alpha)) = \pi_i(\phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha))$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Let $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\rho(s \circ \alpha)) = \sqcup \pi_1(\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha))$. Then $\bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in S_\theta$ for some θ and $\bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha))$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow \bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \pi_1(\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha)) && \text{(using Lemma 3.6)} \\ &\Rightarrow \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \subseteq S_\theta \\ &\Rightarrow \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \neq \perp \\ &\Rightarrow \phi(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) = \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \\ &\Rightarrow \phi(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \in \sqcup \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) \\ &\Rightarrow \phi(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \in \pi_1(\rho(\alpha)) \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \pi_1(\phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha)) \end{aligned}$$

and so $\pi_1(\rho(s \circ \alpha)) \subseteq \pi_1(\phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha))$.

For the reverse inclusion assume that $\bar{q} \in \pi_1(\phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha))$. Consequently we have $\bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in S_\theta$ for some θ and $\phi(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \in \pi_1(\rho(\alpha)) \subseteq X$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow \phi(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \neq \perp \\ &\Rightarrow \phi(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) = \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) (\neq \perp^{E_\theta}) \\ &\Rightarrow \phi_\theta(s)(\bar{q}^{E_\theta}) \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(\alpha)) && \text{(using Remark 3.10(i))} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \pi_1(\phi_\theta(s) \circ \rho_\theta(\alpha)) \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \pi_1(\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha)) && \text{(using Lemma 3.14)} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{q}^{E_\theta} \in \sqcup \pi_1(\rho_\theta(s \circ \alpha)) = \pi_1(\rho(s \circ \alpha)) \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that $\pi_1(\phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha)) \subseteq \pi_1(\rho(s \circ \alpha))$. Proceeding along exactly the same lines we can show that $\pi_2(\rho(s \circ \alpha)) = \pi_2(\phi(s) \circ \rho(\alpha))$ which completes the proof. $\square$

3.4. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $\{\theta\}$ be the collection of all maximal congruences of M . Consider the set X as in (48). The functions $\phi : S_\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ and $\rho : M \rightarrow \mathbb{3}^X$ as defined in Lemma 3.12 and Lemma 3.13, respectively, are monomorphisms. Further, by Lemma 3.14, the pair (ϕ, ρ) is a monomorphism from $(S_\perp, M)$ to the functional C -monoid $(\mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp), \mathbb{3}^X)$. From the construction of X it is also evident that if M and $S_\perp$ are finite then there are only finitely many maximal congruences θ on M and finitely many equivalence classes E_θ on $S_\perp$ and so X must be finite.

Corollary 3.15. *An identity is satisfied in every C -monoid $(S_{\perp}, M)$ where M is an ada if and only if it is satisfied in all functional C -monoids.*

In view of Corollary 3.15 and (36), we have the following result.

Corollary 3.16. *In every C -monoid $(S_{\perp}, M)$ where M is an ada we have $(f \circ T)[f, f] = f$.*

4. CONCLUSION

The notion of C -sets axiomatize the program construct **if-then-else** considered over possibly non-halting programs and non-halting tests. In this work, we extended the axiomatization to C -monoids which include the composition of programs as well as composition of programs with tests. For the class of C -monoids where the C -algebra is an ada we obtain a Cayley-type theorem which exhibits the embedding of such C -monoids into functional C -monoids. Using this, we obtain a mechanism to determine the equivalence of programs through functional C -monoids. It is desirable to achieve such a representation for the general class of C -monoids with no restriction on the C -algebra, which can be considered as future work. Note that the term $f \circ T$ in the standard functional model of a C -monoid represents the aspect of the domain of the function, as used in [4, 11]. It is interesting to study the relation between these two concepts in the current set up.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. M. Bergman. Actions of Boolean rings on sets. *Algebra Universalis*, 28:153–187, 1991.
- [2] S. L. Bloom and R. Tindell. Varieties of “if-then-else”. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12:677–707, 1983.
- [3] D. A. Bochvar. Ob odnom trékhznacnom isčislenii i égo priménénii k analiza paradoksov klassičeskogo rässirénogo funkcional’nogo isčislénia (in Russian). *matématisčeskij sbornik*, 4: 287–308, 1939. Translated to English by M. Bergmann “On a three-valued logical calculus and its application to the analysis of the paradoxes of the classical extended functional calculus”. *History and Philosophy of Logic*, 2:87–112, 1981.
- [4] J. Desharnais, P. Jipsen, and G. Struth. Domain and antidomain semigroups. In *Relations and Kleene algebra in computer science*, volume 5827 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 73–87. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [5] I. Guessarian and J. Meseguer. On the axiomatization of “if-then-else”. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 16:332–357, 1987.
- [6] F. Guzmán and C. C. Squier. The algebra of conditional logic. *Algebra Universalis*, 27:88–110, 1990.
- [7] A. Heyting. Die formalen regeln der intuitionistischen logik, sitzungsberichte der preussischen akademie der wissenschaften, physikalischmathematische klasse,(1930), 42–56 57–71 158–169 in three parts. *Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 42:158–169, 1934.
- [8] S. Igarashi. Semantics of ALGOL-like statements. In *Symposium on Semantics of Algorithmic Languages*, pages 117–177. Springer, 1971.
- [9] M. Jackson and T. Stokes. Agreeable semigroups. *J. Algebra*, 266(2):393–417, 2003.
- [10] M. Jackson and T. Stokes. Semigroups with if-then-else and halting programs. *Int. J. Algebra Comput.*, 19:937–961, 2009.
- [11] M. Jackson and T. Stokes. Monoids with tests and the algebra of possibly non-halting programs. *J. Log. Algebr. Methods Program.*, 84:259–275, 2015.
- [12] J. F. Kennison. Triples and compact sheaf representation. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 20:13–38, 1981.
- [13] S. Kleene. On notation for ordinal numbers. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 3:150–155, 1938.
- [14] J. Lukasiewicz. On three-valued logic. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, 5,(1920), English translation in Borkowski, L.(ed.) 1970. Jan Lukasiewicz: Selected Works, 1920.
- [15] E. Manes. Adas and the equational theory of if-then-else. *Algebra Universalis*, 30:373–394, 1993.

- [16] E. G. Manes. A transformational characterization of if-then-else. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 71:413–417, 1990.
- [17] J. McCarthy. A basis for a mathematical theory of computation. In *Computer programming and formal systems*, pages 33–70. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1963.
- [18] A. H. Mekler and E. M. Nelson. Equational bases for if-then-else. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 16:465–485, 1987.
- [19] G. Panicker, K. V. Krishna, and P. Bhaduri. Axiomatization of **if-then-else** over possibly non-halting programs and tests. *Int. J. Algebra Comput.* To appear.
- [20] D. Pigozzi. Equality-test and if-then-else algebras: Axiomatization and specification. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 20:766–805, 1991.
- [21] R. Sethi. Conditional expressions with equality tests. *J. ACM*, 25:667–674, 1978.
- [22] T. Stokes. Sets with B -action and linear algebra. *Algebra Universalis*, 39:31–43, 1998.
- [23] T. Stokes. Comparison semigroups and algebras of transformations. *Semigroup Forum*, 81:325–334, 2010.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS

A.1. Verification of Example 2.2.

We use the pairs of sets representation given by Guzmán and Squier in [6] and identify $\alpha \in 3^X$ with a *pair of sets* (A, B) of X where $A = \alpha^{-1}(T)$ and $B = \alpha^{-1}(F)$. In this representation $\mathbf{T} = (X, \emptyset)$, $\mathbf{F} = (\emptyset, X)$ and $\mathbf{U} = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. Thus the operation $\circ$ is given as follows:

$$(f \circ \alpha)(x) = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } f(x) \in A; \\ F, & \text{if } f(x) \in B; \\ U, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In other words $f \circ \alpha$ can be identified with the pair of sets (C, D) where $C = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A\}$ and $D = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B\}$.

Axiom (37): Let α be identified with the pair of sets (A, B) . Then $\zeta_{\perp} \circ \alpha = (\emptyset, \emptyset) = \mathbf{U}$ as $\zeta_{\perp}(x) = \perp \notin (A \cup B)$.

Axiom (38): Consider $\mathbf{U} = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. Then $f \circ \mathbf{U} = (\emptyset, \emptyset) = \mathbf{U}$.

Axiom (39):

$$\begin{aligned} (1 \circ \alpha)(x) &= \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } id_{X_{\perp}}(x) \in A; \\ F, & \text{if } id_{X_{\perp}}(x) \in B; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \alpha(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $1 \circ \alpha = \alpha$.

Axiom (40): Let α be identified with the pair of sets (A, B) . Then $f \circ \alpha = (C, D)$ where $C = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A\}$ and $D = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B\}$. Thus $\neg(f \circ \alpha) = (D, C)$. Also $f \circ (\neg\alpha) = f \circ (B, A) = (E, F)$ where $E = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B\}$ and $F = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A\}$. It follows that $(E, F) = (D, C)$.

Axiom (41): Let α, β be represented by the pairs of sets (A_1, A_2) and (B_1, B_2) respectively. Then $\alpha \wedge \beta = (A_1 \cap B_1, A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap B_2))$. Also let $f \circ \alpha = (C_1, C_2)$

where $C_1 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A_1\}$ and $C_2 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A_2\}$, and $f \circ \beta = (D_1, D_2)$ where $D_1 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B_1\}$ and $D_2 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B_2\}$. Then $(C_1, C_2) \wedge (D_1, D_2) = (C_1 \cap D_1, C_2 \cup (C_1 \cap D_2))$. Thus $C_1 \cap D_1 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A_1 \cap B_1\}$ and $C_2 \cup (C_1 \cap D_2) = \{x \in X : f(x) \in A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap B_2)\}$. Hence $f \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) = (f \circ \alpha) \wedge (f \circ \beta)$.

Axiom (42): Consider $f, g \in \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ and $\alpha \in 3^X$ represented by the pair of sets (A, B) .

$$((f \cdot g) \circ \alpha)(x) = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } g(f(x)) \in A; \\ F, & \text{if } g(f(x)) \in B; \\ U, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $g \circ \alpha = (C, D)$ where $C = \{x \in X : g(x) \in A\}$ and $D = \{x \in X : g(x) \in B\}$.

$$(f \circ (g \circ \alpha))(x) = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } f(x) \in C; \\ F, & \text{if } f(x) \in D; \\ U, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We may consider the following three cases.

Case I: $x \in X$ such that $g(f(x)) \in A$: Then $((f \cdot g) \circ \alpha)(x) = T$. Also $f(x) \in C$ as $g(f(x)) \in A$. Thus $(f \circ (g \circ \alpha))(x) = T$.

Case II: $x \in X$ such that $g(f(x)) \in B$: Then $((f \cdot g) \circ \alpha)(x) = F$. Similarly $g(f(x)) \in B$ means that $f(x) \in D$. Thus $(f \circ (g \circ \alpha))(x) = F$.

Case III: $x \in X$ such that $g(f(x)) \notin (A \cup B)$: Then $((f \cdot g) \circ \alpha)(x) = U$. Since $f(x)$ is in neither C nor D it follows that $(f \circ (g \circ \alpha))(x) = U$.

Axiom (43): Consider $\alpha \in 3^X$ represented by the pair of sets (A, B) .

$$(\alpha[f, g] \cdot h)(x) = h(\alpha[f, g](x)) = \begin{cases} h(f(x)), & \text{if } x \in A; \\ h(g(x)), & \text{if } x \in B; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence $\alpha[f, g] \cdot h = \alpha[f \cdot h, g \cdot h]$.

Axiom (44): Let $\alpha \in 3^X$ be represented by the pair of sets (A, B) .

$$(h \cdot \alpha[f, g])(x) = \alpha[f, g](h(x)) = \begin{cases} f(h(x)), & \text{if } h(x) \in A; \\ g(h(x)), & \text{if } h(x) \in B; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $h \circ \alpha$ be represented by the pair of sets (C, D) where $C = \{x \in X : h(x) \in A\}$ and $D = \{x \in X : h(x) \in B\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (h \circ \alpha)[h \cdot f, h \cdot g](x) &= \begin{cases} (h \cdot f)(x), & \text{if } x \in C; \\ (h \cdot g)(x), & \text{if } x \in D; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f(h(x)), & \text{if } h(x) \in A; \\ g(h(x)), & \text{if } h(x) \in B; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $h \cdot \alpha[f, g] = (h \circ \alpha)[h \cdot f, h \cdot g]$.

Axiom (45): Let $\alpha, \beta \in 3^X$ be represented by the pairs of sets (A_1, A_2) and (B_1, B_2) respectively. For $f, g \in \mathcal{T}_o(X_\perp)$ we have the following:

$$h(x) = \alpha[f, g](x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x \in A_1; \\ g(x), & \text{if } x \in A_2; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Also $h \circ \beta = (C_1, C_2)$ where $C_1 = \{x \in X : h(x) \in B_1\}$ and $C_2 = \{x \in X : h(x) \in B_2\}$. Similarly $f \circ \beta = (D_1, D_2)$ where $D_1 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B_1\}$ and $D_2 = \{x \in X : f(x) \in B_2\}$. Let $g \circ \beta = (E_1, E_2)$ where $E_1 = \{x \in X : g(x) \in B_1\}$ and $E_2 = \{x \in X : g(x) \in B_2\}$. Thus $\alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta] = ((A_1, A_2) \wedge (D_1, D_2)) \vee (\neg(A_1, A_2) \wedge (E_1, E_2))$.

This evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta] &= (A_1 \cap D_1, A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap D_2)) \vee (A_2 \cap E_1, A_1 \cup (A_2 \cap E_2)) \\ &= ((A_1 \cap D_1) \cup ((A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap D_2)) \cap (A_2 \cap E_1)), \\ &\quad (A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap D_2)) \cap (A_1 \cup (A_2 \cap E_2))) \\ &= (S_1, S_2) \text{ (say)} \end{aligned}$$

We show that $(C_1, C_2) = (S_1, S_2)$ by standard set theoretic arguments.

First we prove that $C_1 \subseteq S_1$. Let $x \in C_1$. Then $h(x) \in B_1$. Consider the following cases:

Case I: $x \in A_1$: Then $h(x) = f(x) \in B_1$ hence $x \in D_1$. Therefore $x \in A_1 \cap D_1$ and so $x \in S_1$.

Case II: $x \in A_2$: Then $h(x) = g(x) \in B_1$ hence $x \in E_1$. Hence $x \in A_2 \cap E_1 \subseteq A_2$ we have $x \in S_1$.

Case III: $x \notin (A_1 \cup A_2)$: Then $h(x) = \perp \notin B_1$ a contradiction to our assumption that $h(x) \in B_1$. It follows that this case cannot occur.

We show that $S_1 \subseteq C_1$. Let $x \in S_1$. Thus $x \in A_1 \cap D_1$ or

$x \in ((A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap D_2)) \cap (A_2 \cap E_1))$. If $x \in A_1 \cap D_1$ then $h(x) = f(x)$ as $x \in A_1$ and $f(x) \in B_1$ as $x \in D_1$. Thus $h(x) \in B_1$ and so $x \in C_1$. If

$x \in ((A_2 \cup (A_1 \cap D_2)) \cap (A_2 \cap E_1))$, then $x \in (A_2 \cap E_1)$. Thus $h(x) = g(x)$ as $x \in A_2$ and $g(x) \in B_1$ as $x \in E_1$. Hence $h(x) \in B_1$, thus $x \in C_1$.

We show that $C_2 \subseteq S_2$. Let $x \in C_2$ hence $h(x) \in B_2$. Consider the following cases:

Case I: $x \in A_1$: Then $h(x) = f(x) \in B_2$, therefore $x \in D_2$. Hence $x \in A_1 \cap D_2 \subseteq A_1$ and so $x \in S_2$.

Case II: $x \in A_2$: Then $h(x) = g(x) \in B_2$ therefore $x \in E_2$. Thus $x \in A_2 \cap E_2 \subseteq A_2$ and so $x \in S_2$.

Case III: $x \notin (A_1 \cup A_2)$: Then $h(x) = \perp \notin B_2$ which is a contradiction. It follows that this case cannot occur.

Finally we show that $S_2 \subseteq C_2$. Since $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ it follows that $x \in A_1 \cap D_2$ or

$x \in A_2 \cap E_2$. If $x \in A_1 \cap D_2$ then $h(x) = f(x) \in B_2$ and hence $x \in C_2$. If

$x \in A_2 \cap E_2$ then $h(x) = g(x) \in B_2$ hence $x \in C_2$.

Thus $\alpha[f, g] \circ \beta = \alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta]$.

A.2. Verification of Example 2.3.

Let $f, g, h \in S_\perp^X$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{Z}^X$.

Axiom (37): It is easy to see that $(\zeta_\perp \circ \alpha)(x) = U$ for all $x \in X$.

Axiom (38): It is clear that $(f \circ \mathbf{U})(x) = U$.

Axiom (39): Since $S_\perp$ is non-trivial we must have $1 \neq \perp$. If not then for $a \in S_\perp \setminus \{\perp\}$ we have $a = a \cdot 1 = a \cdot \perp = \perp$ a contradiction. It follows that $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_\perp$. Hence $(\zeta_1 \circ \alpha)(x) = \alpha(x)$ as $\zeta_1(x) = 1 \neq \perp$.

Axiom (40): We have

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ (\neg\alpha))(x) &= \begin{cases} (\neg\alpha)(x), & \text{if } f(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \neg(\alpha(x)), & \text{if } f(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \neg(f \circ \alpha)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $f \circ (\neg\alpha) = \neg(f \circ \alpha)$.

Axiom (41): We have

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta))(x) &= \begin{cases} (\alpha \wedge \beta)(x), & \text{if } f(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \alpha(x) \wedge \beta(x), & \text{if } f(x) \neq \perp; \\ U \wedge U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= (f \circ \alpha)(x) \wedge (f \circ \beta)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $f \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) = (f \circ \alpha) \wedge (f \circ \beta)$.

Axiom (42): Since $S_\perp$ has no zero-divisors we have $f(x) \cdot g(x) = \perp \Leftrightarrow f(x) = \perp$ or $g(x) = \perp$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} ((f \cdot g) \circ \alpha)(x) &= \begin{cases} \alpha(x), & \text{if } (f \cdot g)(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \alpha(x), & \text{if } f(x) \cdot g(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \alpha(x), & \text{if } f(x) \neq \perp \text{ and } g(x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= (f \circ (g \circ \alpha))(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(f \cdot g) \circ \alpha = f \circ (g \circ \alpha)$.

Axiom (43): We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha[f, g] \cdot h)(x) &= \alpha[f, g](x) \cdot h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) \cdot h(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = T; \\ g(x) \cdot h(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = F; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \alpha[f \cdot h, g \cdot h](x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\alpha[f, g] \cdot h = \alpha[f \cdot h, g \cdot h]$.

Axiom (44): Consider

$$h \cdot \alpha[f, g](x) = h(x) \cdot \alpha[f, g](x) = \begin{cases} h(x) \cdot f(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = T; \\ h(x) \cdot g(x), & \text{if } \alpha(x) = F; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand

$$(h \circ \alpha)[h \cdot f, h \cdot g](x) = \begin{cases} h(x) \cdot f(x), & \text{if } (h \circ \alpha)(x) = T; \\ h(x) \cdot g(x), & \text{if } (h \circ \alpha)(x) = F; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if $h(x) = \perp$ then $h \cdot \alpha[f, g](x) = \perp = (h \circ \alpha)[h \cdot f, h \cdot g](x)$. Suppose that $h(x) \neq \perp$ then $(h \circ \alpha)(x) = \alpha(x)$. It is clear that in this case as well $h \cdot \alpha[f, g](x) = (h \circ \alpha)[h \cdot f, h \cdot g](x)$ holds. Thus $h \cdot \alpha[f, g] = (h \circ \alpha)[h \cdot f, h \cdot g]$.

Axiom (45): Consider

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha[f, g] \circ \beta)(x) &= \begin{cases} \beta(x), & \text{if } \alpha[f, g](x) \neq \perp; \\ U, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \beta(x), & \text{if } (f(x) \neq \perp, \alpha(x) = T) \text{ or } (g(x) \neq \perp, \alpha(x) = F); \\ U, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We have $(\alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta])(x) = (\alpha(x) \wedge (f \circ \beta)(x)) \vee (\neg \alpha(x) \wedge (g \circ \beta)(x))$.

If $f(x) \neq \perp$ and $\alpha(x) = T$ we have

$$(\alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta])(x) = (T \wedge \beta(x)) \vee (F \wedge (g \circ \beta)(x)) = \beta(x) \vee F = \beta(x) = (\alpha[f, g] \circ \beta)(x).$$

If $g(x) \neq \perp$ and $\alpha(x) = F$ we have

$$(\alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta])(x) = (F \wedge (f \circ \beta)(x)) \vee (T \wedge \beta(x)) = F \vee \beta(x) = \beta(x) = (\alpha[f, g] \circ \beta)(x).$$

In all other cases it can be easily ascertained that

$$(\alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta])(x) = U = (\alpha[f, g] \circ \beta)(x). \text{ Thus } \alpha[f, g] \circ \beta = \alpha[f \circ \beta, g \circ \beta].$$

A.3. Verification of Example 2.4.

Axiom (37): It is clear that $\perp \circ \alpha = U$.

Axiom (38): It is obvious that $t \circ U = U$.

Axiom (39): Since $S_\perp$ is non-trivial it follows that $1 \neq \perp$. Consequently $1 \circ \alpha = \alpha$.

Axiom (40): If $s = \perp$ then $s \circ (\neg \alpha) = U = \neg(s \circ \alpha)$. If $s \neq \perp$ then

$$s \circ (\neg \alpha) = \neg \alpha = \neg(s \circ \alpha). \text{ Thus } s \circ (\neg \alpha) = \neg(s \circ \alpha).$$

Axiom (41): If $s = \perp$ then $s \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) = U$ and $(s \circ \alpha) \wedge (s \circ \beta) = U \wedge U = U$. If $s \neq \perp$ then $s \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) = \alpha \wedge \beta = (s \circ \alpha) \wedge (s \circ \beta)$. Thus $s \circ (\alpha \wedge \beta) = (s \circ \alpha) \wedge (s \circ \beta)$.

Axiom (42): Consider $s, t \in S_\perp$ such that $s \cdot t = \perp$. Then $(s \cdot t) \circ \alpha = \perp \circ \alpha = U$. Since $S_\perp$ has no non-zero zero-divisors we have $s = \perp$ or $t = \perp$ and so $s \circ (t \circ \alpha) = U$ in either case. If $s \cdot t \neq \perp$ then $(s \cdot t) \circ \alpha = \alpha$ and $s \circ (t \circ \alpha) = t \circ \alpha = \alpha$ as neither s nor t are $\perp$. Thus $(s \cdot t) \circ \alpha = s \circ (t \circ \alpha)$.

Axiom (43): As $\alpha \in \{T, F, U\}$ we consider the following three cases:

Case I: $\alpha = T$: Then $\alpha[s, t] \cdot u = T[s, t] \cdot u = s \cdot u = T[s \cdot u, t \cdot u]$.

Case II: $\alpha = F$: Then $\alpha[s, t] \cdot u = F[s, t] \cdot u = t \cdot u = F[s \cdot u, t \cdot u]$.

Case III: $\alpha = U$: Then $\alpha[s, t] \cdot u = U[s, t] \cdot u = \perp \cdot u = \perp = U[s \cdot u, t \cdot u]$.

Thus $\alpha[s, t] \cdot u = \alpha[s \cdot u, t \cdot u]$.

Axiom (44): Consider the following cases:

Case I: $r = \perp$: Then

$r \cdot \alpha[s, t] = \perp \cdot \alpha[s, t] = \perp = U[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (\perp \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t]$.

Case II: $r \neq \perp$: We again consider the following three cases:

Case i: $\alpha = T$:

$r \cdot \alpha[s, t] = r \cdot T[s, t] = r \cdot s = T[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ T)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t]$.

Case ii: $\alpha = F$:

$r \cdot \alpha[s, t] = r \cdot F[s, t] = r \cdot t = F[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ F)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t]$.

Case iii: $\alpha = U$:

$r \cdot \alpha[s, t] = r \cdot U[s, t] = r \cdot \perp = \perp = U[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ U)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t] = (r \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t]$.

Thus $r \cdot \alpha[s, t] = (r \circ \alpha)[r \cdot s, r \cdot t]$.

Axiom (45): Consider the following three cases:

Case I: $\alpha = T$: $\alpha[s, t] \circ \beta = T[s, t] \circ \beta = s \circ \beta = T[s \circ \beta, t \circ \beta]$.

Case II: $\alpha = F$: $\alpha[s, t] \circ \beta = F[s, t] \circ \beta = t \circ \beta = F[s \circ \beta, t \circ \beta]$.

Case III: $\alpha = U$: $\alpha[s, t] \circ \beta = U[s, t] \circ \beta = \perp \circ \beta = U = U[s \circ \beta, t \circ \beta]$.

Thus $\alpha[s, t] \circ \beta = \alpha[s \circ \beta, t \circ \beta]$.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GUWAHATI, GUWAHATI, INDIA

E-mail address: `p.gayatri@iitg.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GUWAHATI, GUWAHATI, INDIA

E-mail address: `kvk@iitg.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GUWAHATI, GUWAHATI, INDIA

E-mail address: `pbbhaduri@iitg.ac.in`